

**REMARKS**

The specification has been amended to correct a minor typographical error.

Claims 1, 9 and 40 have been amended to improve form and not to avoid any prior art.

Claims 47-49 have been added. Claims 1-49 are now pending in this application.

Claims 1-46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wheeler, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 5,572,583; hereinafter Wheeler '583). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites an apparatus for decentralizing communication services that includes a switch fabric, a switch intelligence, a switch fabric proxy service and a feature processor. Claim 1, as amended, recites that the switch fabric proxy service provides a normalized interface between the switch fabric and the switch intelligence for communications involving the switch fabric and interfacing to the switch intelligence with a uniform application program interface. Claim 1, as amended, further recites that the normalized interface comprises any one of a plurality of vendor-specific interfaces associated with the switch fabric and the uniform interface comprises a non-vendor specific interface associated with the switch intelligence. Wheeler '583 does not disclose this combination of features.

For example, Wheeler '583 does not disclose a switch fabric proxy service that is configured to provide a normalized interface between the switch fabric and the switch intelligence and interfacing to the switch intelligence with a uniform application program interface, or that the normalized interface comprises any one of a plurality of vendor-specific interfaces associated with the switch fabric and the uniform interface comprises a

non-vendor specific interface associated with the switch intelligence, as recited in amended claim 1.

For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 1 are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons claim 1 is allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 2-8 are respectfully requested.

Claim 9 recites an apparatus comprising a switch-fabric proxy service for providing a normalized interface between a switch fabric and a switch intelligence for communications involving said switch fabric by interfacing to said switch fabric with any one of a plurality of application programming interfaces and interfacing to said switch intelligence with a uniform application programming interface.

Initially, the applicants note that the features recited in claim 9 were previously recited in the parent application (08/580,712, which issued as U.S. Patent 6,041,109 and from which this reissue application is based). In the parent application, the Notice of Allowability dated November 3, 1999 included Reasons for Allowance that stated that the features now recited in claim 9 were not taught by the prior art of record (See Reasons for Allowance). The applicants note that Wheeler '583 (used in the present rejection) was not cited in the parent application. However, Wheeler, Jr. (U.S. Patent 5,583,920; hereinafter Wheeler '920) was cited in the parent application and Wheeler, Jr. '920 is a continuation-in-part of Wheeler '583. Further, the portion of Wheeler '583 now cited in the rejection of claim 9 was included in Wheeler, Jr. '920 (See Fig. 2, Wheeler '920). Therefore, the applicants believe that claim 9 recites features that are neither

disclosed nor suggested by Wheeler '583 for the same reasons Wheeler '920 did not disclose or suggest these features, as admitted in the Reasons for Allowance. In any event, Wheeler '583 does not disclose or suggest the features of claim 9, as discussed in the detail below.

The Office Action states that Wheeler '583's administrative module 55 is equivalent to the claimed switch fabric proxy service and that administrative module 55 provides a normalized interface 61 between the switch fabric and the switch intelligence for all communications involving said switch fabric by interfacing to the switch fabric with any one of a plurality of application program interfaces 59 and interfacing to the switch intelligence with a uniform application program interface 73 and points to Fig. 2 for support (Office Action – pages 2-3). The Office Action also states that devices 51 and 53 in Fig. 2 of Wheeler '583 are equivalent to the switch fabric and that integrated service control point (ISCP) 40 is equivalent to the switch intelligence. The applicants respectfully disagree.

Fig. 2 of Wheeler '583 illustrates a block diagram of an electronic program controlled switch which may be used as any one of the service switching point (SSP) type central offices (COs) in the system of Fig. 1. In other words, the elements illustrated in Fig. 2 may be used as any one of CO switching systems 11, 13, 15 and 17, labeled as SSPs in Fig. 1. As illustrated in Fig. 2, the CO switch includes a number of different modules, including interface modules 51, communications module 53 and administrative module 55 (Wheeler '583 – col. 7, lines 11-17). Therefore, the element in Wheeler '583 alleged to be equivalent to the claimed switch fabric proxy service (i.e., administrative

module 55) is part of the same switch (i.e., any one of the SSPs 11-17 in Fig. 1) as the elements alleged to be equivalent to the switch fabric (i.e., elements 51 and 53).

Claim 9, however, recites that the switch-fabric proxy service provides a normalized interface between a switch fabric and a switch intelligence for communications involving the switch fabric. Since administrative module 55 of Wheeler '583 includes the switch fabric portion, administrative module 55 cannot be fairly construed to be equivalent to the claimed switch-fabric proxy service that provides a normalized interface between a switch fabric and a switch intelligence.

In addition, claim 9 recites that the switch fabric provides a normalized interface between the switch fabric and switch intelligence by interfacing to the switch fabric with any one of a plurality of application programming interfaces and interfacing to the switch intelligence with a uniform application programming interface. The Office Action states that administrative module processor 61 provides a normalized interface between the switch fabric and switch intelligence by interfacing with any one of a plurality of application program interfaces 59 and interfacing to the switch intelligence with a uniform application program interface 73 (Office Action – pages 2-3). The applicants respectfully disagree.

Administrative module processor 61 of Wheeler '583 is a computer equipped with disc storage 63 for controlling the operations of the CO. Common channel inter-office signaling (CCIS) terminal 73 and its associated data unit 71 provide a signaling link between administrative module processor 61 and an SS7 network connection to a signaling transfer point (STP) for facilitating call processing signal communications with other COs and with the ISCP 40 (Wheeler '583 – col. 7, lines 51-65). Wheeler '583 does

not disclose or suggest that this signaling link between administrative module processor 61 and CCIS terminal 73 is an application programming interface (API), much less a uniform API, as recited in claim 9.

For at least the reasons discussed above, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 9 are respectfully requested.

Independent claims 11 and 22 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 9. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 9, Wheeler '583 does not disclose or suggest the features of claims 11 and 22. Accordingly, allowance of claims 11 and 22 are respectfully requested.

Claims 10, 12-21 and 23-28 variously depend on claims 9, 11 and 22 and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons their respective independent claims are allowable.

In addition, these claims recite additional features neither disclosed nor suggested by Wheeler '583. For example, claim 16 recites that the switch-fabric proxy service translates switch-fabric communications into switch-intelligence communications. The Office Action states that Wheeler '583 discloses this feature and points to col. 8, lines 1-13 and col. 9, lines 8-56 for support (Office Action – page 5). The applicants respectfully disagree.

Wheeler '583 at col. 8, lines 1-13 discloses that call store 67 of administrative module 55 stores translation information retrieved from disc storage 63 together with routing information needed for processing a call. This is not equivalent to a switch fabric proxy service that translates switch-fabric communications into switch-intelligence communications. Rather, this portion of Wheeler '583 merely discloses that a portion of

administrative module 55 (alleged to be equivalent to the switch-fabric proxy service) stores information needed for processing a call.

Wheeler '583 at col. 9, lines 8-56 discloses a conventional CCIS call processing method with respect to the system in Fig. 1. More particularly, this portion of Wheeler '583 discloses that the SSP type switches recognize a variety of events as "triggers" for activating a query and response type AIN interaction with ISCP 40 (Wheeler '583 – col. 9, lines 39-50). Detecting triggers in this manner and accessing ISCP 40 using queries is not equivalent to translating switch-fabric communications into switch-intelligence communications, as recited in claim 16. For at least this additional reason, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 16 are respectfully requested.

Claim 29 recites a switch-fabric proxy service comprising means for translating switch-fabric communications into switch-intelligence communications and means for translating switch-intelligence communications into switch-fabric communications. The Office Action has not particularly addressed these features with respect to claim 29. However, with respect to a similar feature in claim 16, the Office Action states that Wheeler '583 discloses that the switch-fabric proxy service translates switch-fabric communications into switch-intelligence communications and points to col. 8, lines 1-13 and col. 9, lines 8-56 for support. The applicants respectfully disagree.

As discussed above with respect to claim 16, col. 8, lines 1-13 of Wheeler '583 merely discloses that a portion of administrative module 55 (alleged to be equivalent to the switch-fabric proxy service) stores information needed for processing a call and col. 9, lines 8-56 of Wheeler '583 merely discloses a conventional CCIS call processing method that uses triggers. Neither of these portions of Wheeler '583 discloses or suggest

means for translating switch-fabric communications into switch-intelligence communications or means for translating switch-intelligence communications into switch-fabric communications, as recited in claim 29. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 29 are respectfully requested.

Claims 30 and 32 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 29. For reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 29, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 30 and 32 are respectfully requested.

Claims 31 and 33-39 are dependent on claims 30 and 32, respectively, and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons claims 30 and 32 are allowable. Accordingly, allowance of claims 31 and 33-39 is respectfully requested.

Claim 40 recites an apparatus comprising a switch intelligence for controlling a switch fabric, where the switch intelligence is physically separate from the switch fabric and is couplable to a feature processor that executes at least one telecommunications function, and the switch intelligence comprises aspects of data processing required to complete a bearer request.

The Office Action has not particularly addressed these features. The applicants respectfully request that any subsequent Office Action address these features or withdraw the rejection. In any event, Wheeler '583 discloses that the switch intelligence is included in the switch (SSPs in Fig. 2). Wheeler '583 does not disclose a switch intelligence that is physically separate from the switch fabric. Wheeler '583 also does not disclose that the switch intelligence is couplable to a feature processor that executes at least one telecommunications function, where the switch intelligence comprises aspects of data processing required to complete a bearer request, as recited in claim 40.

For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 40 are respectfully requested.

Claims 41-43 are dependent on claim 40 and are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons claim 40 is allowable. In addition, these claims recite additional features neither disclosed nor suggested by Wheeler '583. For example, claim 41 recites that the switch intelligence further comprises at least one of a facility service, a call connection manager service, and a call segment instance service, where said at least one of a facility service, a call connection manager service and a call segment instance service is distributed over a plurality of network elements.

The Office Action has not addressed these features. The applicants respectfully request that any subsequent Office Action address these features or withdraw the rejection. In any event, Wheeler '583 does not disclose or suggest these features. For at least this additional reason, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 41 are respectfully requested.

As to claim 44, the Office Action states that the intelligent peripheral (IP) is equivalent to the claimed feature processor and devices 211, 213, 203 and 205 are equivalent to the claimed application programming interface and points to Fig. 4B for support (Office Action – pages 5-6). The applicants respectfully disagree.

In Fig. 4B, device 211 is a router, device 213 is an IP communications server, devices 203A and 203B are direct talk modules and device 205 is a speech recognition module. Wheeler '583 does not disclose or suggest that the any of devices 211, 213, 203 and 205 in Fig. 4B is an application programming interface that translates feature



processor communications into at least one of communications defined according to a uniform interface and switch-intelligence communications, as recited in claim 44.

For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 44 are respectfully requested.

As to claim 45, the Office Action states that the link between devices 59 and 61 in Wheeler '583 is equivalent to the claimed first interface and that the link between devices 61 and 73 is equivalent to the claimed second interface (Office Action – page 6). The applicants respectfully disagree.

Administrative module processor 61 and message switch 59, as discussed previously, are both part of the same SSP (Wheeler '583 – col. 7, lines 11-18). Therefore, the interface between these two components cannot be fairly construed to be equivalent to an interface from a switch-fabric proxy service communicable with a switch fabric, as required by claim 45. In addition, the interface from administrative module processor 61 to CCIS terminal 73 is an interface from part of the switch to an external terminal. This is not equivalent to an interface included in a switch-fabric proxy service that is communicable with the switch intelligence, as required by claim 45.

For at least these reasons, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 45 are respectfully requested.

Claim 46 is dependent on claim 45 and is believed to be allowable for at least the reasons claim 45 is allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 46 are respectfully requested.

**NEW CLAIMS**

Claims 47-49 have been added. These claims recite features neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art of record. For example, claim 47 recites an apparatus that includes a call completion device for providing bearer functions, the call completion device performing communications with a switch intelligence that is separated from the call completion device. The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest these features.

Claim 48 recites that the switch intelligence comprises a call state model, wherein the call completion device communicates with the switch intelligence to affect a call state. The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest these features.

Claim 49 recites that the call state is represented in the call state model. The prior art of record does not disclose or suggest this feature.

Accordingly, allowance of claims 47-49 is respectfully requested.


**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and the timely allowance of this application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 13-2491 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & SNYDER, L.L.P.

By:   
Glenn Snyder  
Reg. No. 41,428

Date: August 13, 2003

11240 Waples Mill Road  
Suite 300  
Fairfax, VA 22030  
Telephone: (571) 432-0800  
Facsimile: (571) 432-0808